

Slaughter Act to put a stop to the mistreatment of animals.

Mr. President, I thank the chairman and ranking member of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee for their support in this every important effort.

#### STATUS OF APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as Members are aware, all 13 appropriations bills have cleared the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Four bills have been sent to the President for signature, of which three have been signed into law. The Defense, Homeland Security, and Legislative Branch appropriations bills have been signed, and the Interior appropriations bill is awaiting signature.

Five appropriations bills are in conference. These are the Military Construction, Energy and Water Development, Labor-HHS-Education, Foreign Operations, and Transportation and Treasury appropriations bills. The Military Construction appropriations bill completed conference yesterday, and the Energy and Water Development conference met today.

Four appropriations bills are awaiting completion of Senate action—Agriculture, VA-HUD, Commerce-Justice-State, and the District of Columbia. The Agriculture appropriations bill is being considered on the floor today.

Mr. President, the Senate should proceed to process these four final bills on the floor and to send them to conference with the House. This will protect our rights as Senators to offer amendments. The Senate should process 13 individual appropriations bills, and avoid an omnibus appropriations bill. Omnibus appropriations bills have the effect of shoehorning large segments of the Federal Government into one monstrous bill. Members' rights to amend legislation are severely limited, and they will not be able to know what they are voting for or against. Omnibus appropriations legislation also has the result of bringing the White House to the table, which has the effect of blurring the distinction between the responsibilities of the executive branch and the constitutional responsibilities of the legislative branch to develop legislation under the separation of powers. This is no way to legislate.

I thank and commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. STEVENS, for his steadfast pursuit of the goal of processing 13 individual appropriations bills. The Senate would not be at this stage of processing the appropriations bills, if my friend, the Senator from Alaska, had not pursued this matter with such vigor on his side.

Again, I thank my distinguished and able colleague, Mr. STEVENS, for his efforts.

#### RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE BROADBAND LOAN PROGRAM

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I support the effort spearheaded by my col-

leagues, Senator BURNS and Senator DORGAN, and have serious objections to the Bush administration's proposal to gut the only national program we've ever enacted to get broadband high speed Internet connectivity deployed across our country.

It was just last year that Congress passed, as part of the farm bill, the only national broadband deployment incentive I am aware of that has been enacted by the Federal Government—a program that was supposed to provide over \$700 million in loans a year to help get broadband to all parts of the country—\$700 million in loans a year to help create and bring jobs to rural parts of the country—\$700 million a year to help improve health care and education delivery to places like Upstate New York, rural Montana, North Dakota, Alaska, Iowa, and all across the country—\$700 million a year to help improve emergency communications systems so that our first responders can actually receive those calls for help.

From a fiscal perspective, you couldn't ask for a better deal. It takes just \$20 million in Federal resources to leverage over \$700 million in loans—\$700 million in loans plus at least another 20 percent in investment from the private sector. Has the program been popular? You better believe it has. In just 9 months since the Rural Utilities Service published regulations for the broadband loan program, the RUS has received applications that total over \$1 billion. Our rural communities across the country recognize the promise of new telecommunications technologies.

Our rural communities and the coalition of Members from Congress that helped create the RUS broadband loan program in last year's farm bill aren't the only ones who recognize the promise of broadband. Look what other countries are doing.

A recent study by the International Telecommunications Union, the UN's telecommunications agency, confirmed what many of us already know. South Korea is leading the world in numbers of high-speed Internet connections per capita, with Hong Kong and Canada coming in at second and third. Where is the U.S. a distant 11th.

And these other countries are outspending us on broadband infrastructure. Sweden has set aside some \$800 million on broadband deployment in rural areas of the country. France is following suit, having announced not long ago its plans to invest \$1.5 billion on broadband infrastructure over 5 years. In Japan, through the majority government owned Nippon Telegraph and Telephone, the country is in the middle of a huge fiber-to-the-home project across the country. In Korea, the government is laying out some \$15 billion to provide an optical fiber connection to 84 percent of homes by 2005.

We are falling behind. I don't know about the rest of my colleagues, but I think that's a huge problem. People in

upstate New York know it's a huge problem. There is little disputing that a nation with ubiquitous broadband will be more efficient and productive than a nation without it. Just a couple weeks ago, the Wall Street Journal had a story titled, What's Slowing Us Down?, with the byline, "Broadband is seen as a critical part of the national economy. Yet the U.S. lags behind other countries."

The Wall Street Journal piece points out that, "Rising rates of high-speed Internet access are expected to trigger everything from increased sales of new computers to a massive rise in worker productivity." A recent Brookings Institution study found that universal broadband access could add \$300 billion a year to the U.S. economy. Forgoing a major broadband rollout, the Wall Street Journal notes, might not only hinder economic growth, but also worsen an already bleak picture for battered telecommunications and high-tech industries.

That explains the letter that a host of companies and high-tech associations have sent to Senators BENNETT and KOHL, the managers on this important bill. This letter pleading to restore funding of the RUS broadband loan program is signed by 3M, Alcatel, Cisco Systems, Corning, Intel, Nortel Networks, Siemens, and so many others who recognize the importance of this modest investment.

But they are not the only ones we're hearing from. I am hearing from small carriers across New York who need assistance to get broadband deployed to their rural areas—companies like Castle Cable Television in Alexandria Bay, NY who want to do the right thing—who recognize the potential of broadband to bring jobs and better services to their communities.

So what is our plan, our national strategy to help ensure broadband gets deployed across America? What is our plan to ensure America's competitiveness? Well, the administration's plan and the one that's come out of committee in the Senate is to crush the one permanent broadband deployment program the Federal government has ever enacted.

I understand that we have replaced \$10 million that would leverage over \$350 million in broadband loans with \$10 million in grants. That doesn't make any sense. I am not suggesting we not do grants—but it doesn't make fiscal sense to saw off \$10 million that will leverage over \$350 million in loans for a simple \$10 million in grants.

And it certainly doesn't make sense to take away the Rural Utilities Service's administrative funding and capacity to process and review the pending applications. Rural communities across the country, like Alex Bay in New York, need these resources to create and attract jobs. And our country needs to make these investments if we're to stay ahead of—or at least competitive with—South Korea, Hong Kong, Japan, and our neighbors to the